

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/620,059	07/15/2003	Jason Zhisheng Gao	NFL-0315	7683
7590 05/18/2004			EXAMINER	
ExxonMobil Research and Engineering Company			CASTRO, ARNOLD	
P.O. Box 900 Annandale, NJ 08801-0900			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Amandaic, 113	00001-0700		3747	

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

7/		Annlinetian Na	Annlicent/e)	<del>-\/\/ \</del>				
•		Application No.	Applicant(s)	,				
Office Action Summary		10/620,059	GAO ET AL.					
		Examiner	Art Unit					
		Arnold Castro	3747	L				
The MAILING D. Period for Reply	ATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence ad	dress				
A SHORTENED STAT THE MAILING DATE ( - Extensions of time may be avafter SIX (6) MONTHS from t - If the period for reply is specified If NO period for reply is specified.	CUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL OF THIS COMMUNICATION. ailable under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.16 he mailing date of this communication. d above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep fied above, the maximum statutory period or extended period for reply will, by statut- ice later than three months after the mailin nt. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a ly within the statutory minimum of thir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON e. cause the application to become Al	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timel NTHS from the mailing date of this c BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ly. ommunication.				
Status								
1) Responsive to c 2a) This action is FII	ommunication(s) filed on NAL. 2b)⊠ Thi	 s action is non-final.						
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims								
4a) Of the above 5) ☐ Claim(s) 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 8) ☐ Claim(s)  Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification	are rejected.	or election requirement.	by the Examiner.					
Applicant may no	request that any objection to the wing sheet(s) including the correct aration is objected to by the E	e drawing(s) be held in abeya ction is required if the drawing	ince. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 C					
Priority under 35 U.S.C.								
12) Acknowledgmen a) All b) Sor 1. Certified of 2. Certified of 3. Copies of application	t is made of a claim for foreigne * c) None of: copies of the priority documer copies of the priority documer the certified copies of the priority n from the International Burea detailed Office action for a lis	nts have been received.  Its have been received in a point documents have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this Nationa	l Stage				
Attachment(e)	,							
	ed (PTO-892) Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) atement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PT	<sup>-</sup> O-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/620,059

Art Unit: 3747

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
   The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claim 4,8,9,and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 4, 8, 9, and 16 provides for the use of items claimed in claims 1, 5, 9, and 13 respectively, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 4,8,9,and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd.* v. *Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

<sup>(</sup>b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Application/Control Number: 10/620,059

Art Unit: 3747

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Freesh (US/4,356,806).

Freesh discloses a device to extend the useful life of a lubricant in an EGR equipped engine comprising: a) An chemical filter (41) placed in the EGR stream b) A chemical filter (42) placed just before the intake manifold c) A heat exchanger/cooler (40) placed in the upstream of the chemical filters to reduce the temperature of said EGR stream and to increase the relative humidity.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- Claims 2, 3, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freesh. Claims 1 and 5 apply as above. However the express relative humidity is not disclosed. At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to optimize the humidity through routine experimentation. Applicant has not disclosed that these particular humidity ratios provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem.
- 5. Claims 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freesh 4,356,806 in view of Rohrbach et al. (US 6,379,564).

Application/Control Number: 10/620,059 Page 4

Art Unit: 3747

6. Freesh disclose a device to extend the useful life of a lubricant in an EGR equipped engine comprising: a) An optional chemical filter (41) placed in the EGR stream b) A chemical filter (42) placed just before the intake manifold c) A heat exchanger/cooler (40) placed in the upstream of the chemical filters to reduce the temperature of said EGR stream and to increase the relative humidity. However, Feesh does not disclose expressly an oil filter capable of neutralizing acids in the engine lubricant. Inherently, the engine of Freesh has an oil filter.

Rochrbach discloses an engine oil filter that is capable of neutralizing acids in the engine lubricant.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to replace the oil filter of the engine of Freesh with an oil filter disclosed in Rochrbach.

Modivation would have been to increase the life of the oil.

As for claims 11, 12, 14, and 15 the express relative humidity is not disclosed in either reference. At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to optimize the humidity through routine experimentation. Applicant has not disclosed that these particular humidity ratios provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem.

#### Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Tuourtellotte et al. was discussed in description, Sanders is a chemical filter in EGR passage.

Art Unit: 3747

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arnold Castro whose telephone number is (703) 305-0039. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yuen Henry can be reached on (703) 308-1946. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

of

Arnold Castro Examiner Art Unit 3747

AC

MAHMOUD GIMIE PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER